

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/789,558		DONOHOE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Diane Yabut		3734	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Diane Yabut. (3) _____

(2) Brian Schar. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 April 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Cardica Pas-port @ proximal anastomosis tool

Claim(s) discussed: 12, 1, 9

Identification of prior art discussed: Nobis, Houser (20020173808)
(6,605,098)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant will consider using language to convey the cutting device remaining in the hollow chamber after forming an opening for clms. 1 and 12 to distinguish over Nobis.

Applicant will also withdraw "single control" limitation in clm. 12.

Also, Applicant will clarify the limitation regarding the cutting device being "movable away from the axial centerline of the lumen" in clm. 3

Applicant will cancel clm. 9